

# DRAFT MINUTES

## City of Flagstaff BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE



**Thursday, June 4, 2020 | 4:30 pm**

Virtual meeting via Microsoft Teams

---

### **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 4:34 pm. On roll call, the following Committee members were present:

Mark Haughwout, chair  
Kim Austin  
Daniel Crim  
Jeff Goulden  
Estella Hollander  
Susan Hueftle

Members absent:

Matthew Mitchell

The following City and agency staff were present:

Jeff Bauman, traffic engineer  
Stacy Fobar, deputy city clerk  
Martin Ince, multimodal transportation planner

Public present:

None

### **I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS**

#### **1. Announcements**

Mr. Haughwout reported that construction on eastbound Butler at Amberwood was forcing bikes into the vehicle lanes. A sign should be posted.

#### **2. Public Comment**

There was no Public Comment.

### **3. Approval of Minutes**

Minutes from the March 5 regular were not available at the meeting.

## **II. OLD BUSINESS**

### **1. Active transportation master plan/FUTS master plan**

Mr. Ince presented information on a draft bikeways plan, including a detailed review of potential facility types, bikeway hierarchies, and a short and long-term network. The committee discussed a number of items related to the bikeways plan:

Separated bike lanes:

- Ms. Hollander: any buffering or protection is appreciated.
- Ms. Hueftle: are there any stats regarding preferences for the 60 percent cyclists? The corridor principle indicates that facilities should be available along the entire route.
- Ms. Hollander: there can be a mixture of facilities, depending on what works best in a given situation.
- Mr. Crim: who will maintain these facilities?

Cycletrack/FUTS

- Ms. Hueftle: where have these been considered?
- Ms. Austin: concerned that cyclists won't be able to access destinations on the far side of the street.
- Ms. Hollander: agrees that a lack of crossings will be a problem. Cycletracks and FUTS work best when there are long uninterrupted stretches, like through a park.
- Mr. Haughwout: Asked about the plans for bicycle accommodation on the Lone Tree overpass.
- Mr. Crim: would be good to have bike lane on the east side of the overpass.
- Mr. Bauman: the Route 66 to Sawmill section is planned for 5 to 6 years, and the section from Sawmill to Kinsey will be within 20 years.
- Mr. Goulden: there is an existing FUTS along the east side of Lone Tree to the south. Will this trail be extended north?

Primary bikeways

- Ms. Austin: the north end of the Fort Valley FUTS crosses a lot of driveways. She worries about the potential for crashes.
- Ms. Hollander: what is the difference between primary and secondary routes? Secondary routes should mainly include higher-level facilities.
- Ms. Austin: Kaibab is an industrial street, there could be potential conflicts.
- Ms. Hueftle: Is it possible to include private streets as bikeways?

Secondary bikeways

- Mr. Crim: signing will be important to unify the network.
- Mr. Goulden: asked about the status of the Sheep Crossing FUTS Trail.
- Ms. Hueftle: will primary and secondary bikeways be programmed for construction? Does the plan consider student housing?
- Mr. Crim: has signing been programmed as a separate project?

Short and long-term bikeways

- Ms. Hollander: have protected intersections been identified? It would be more impactful to build enhanced facilities in the first phases.

**III. NEW BUSINESS**

There was no New Business

**IV. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS**

**1. Reports**

There was no discussion on the reports.

**2. Concluding Announcements**

The Committee had several questions, including the status of the project in front of City Hall, the status of Gotcha bikeshare, and how long the City will conduct virtual meetings.

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:53 pm